Amdt. dated July 1, 2008

Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

## Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig.'s 1-3. These sheets, which include Fig.'s 1-3, replace the original sheets including Fig.'s 1-3. In Fig.'s 1-3 a previously omitted label as "Prior Art" has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Amdt. dated July 1, 2008

Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 remain in this application.

The holding of allowable subject matter in claims 4, 6, 7, 9-12, 18-20, 22, and 24 is

gratefully acknowledged.

Drawing objections

In the Office action the Examiner objected to Fig.'s 1-3 for not being designated with a legend such as –Prior Art--. This Amendment revises Fig.'s 1-3 to correct this informality. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawings objection and approval of the enclosed, proposed Replacement drawings.

Claim objections

Claim 1 has been amended to correct the typographical error noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that this correction does not affect the scope of

the claim.

Claims 21 and 24 have also been amended to correct minor grammatical errors.

These corrections are not in response to any rejection or objection and are not believed to

affect the scope of the claim.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claim amendments should not

give rise to any filewrapper estoppel.

10

N/Control (CEP/Applications) GB profes (CEP) of GERONAL PROGEOUS ASSETS (AMERICA WORLD VERSION

Amdt. dated July 1, 2008

Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

Rejection under section 112

Claims 15-17 stand rejected because of the character string (Capacitor) that appears

in the text. This character string is from Figures 10 and 12. This character string is used to

label one of the waveforms in each of those figures. The following material is quoted from

the MPEP.

608.01(m) Form of Claims [R-3]

...Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed

description and the drawings may be used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims. The reference

characters, however, should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid

confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims.

The use of reference characters is to be considered as having no effect on

the scope of the claims. ...

The reference element here is properly enclosed in parentheses and capitalized in the same

fashion that it is used in the figures. Rejection of the claims for insertion of a reference

element in parentheses is improper and accordingly respectfully traversed.

Art rejections

The art rejections are respectfully traversed.

11

Amdt. dated July 1, 2008

Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

Since the references are complex, Applicant will confine his remarks to those

portions of the references cited by the Examiner, except as otherwise indicated. Applicant

makes no representation as to the contents of other portions of the references.

Any of the Examiner's rejections and/or points of argument that are not addressed

below would appear to be moot in view of the following. Nevertheless, Applicant reserves

the right to respond to those rejections and arguments and to advance additional arguments

at a later date. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are

conceded.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection over Knapp under section 102(b)

is not appropriate. That section requires a reference to be published more than one year

prior to the filing date of the application rejected. The priority date of the present

application is March 27, 2003. The publication date of the Knapp reference is Dec. 24,

2002, less than one year prior to the priority date.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites providing first and second drive signals to each pixel for storage on

the pixel for first and second periods of time. The durations of the first and second periods

of time are controlled to vary pixel light output.

Knapp is cited by the Examiner. Knapp shows a scheme for allowing scan

direction to be reversed or for implementing a dot inversion drive scheme, rather than for

varying pixel light output. The row signals do have more than one voltage level; however,

12

Amdt. dated July 1, 2008

Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

it does not appear that both levels are pixel drive levels as claimed by Applicant, since they

do not appear to vary pixel light output, but rather simply allow for voltages to be reversed,

so far as Applicant can tell.

The periods of Knapp's special signals along the rows may be varied, per the

section cited by the Examiner (cols 5 and 6); however, Applicant does not understand that

these variations have any effect on pixel light output, especially since the voltages do not

rise to the level of pixel select signals (per col. 4, lines 56 et seq.). In any case, the

variations are only explained as permissible ranges. The effect of the different voltages

row signals appears to be due to the levels of these signals, not their duration.

Applicant accordingly does not believe that the reference at least as explained by

the Examiner teaches or suggests the invention. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 23

This claim recites analogue pixel drive signals.

In rejecting this claim over Dawson, the Examiner fails to indicate where the pixel

drive signals are analogue. Clarification is accordingly respectfully requested.

Also the claim recites timing means for controlling duration of the application of

pixel drive signals.

The Examiner points to the display controller for this limitation. Dawson does not

say much about this display controller. Applicant suspects, however, that the only timing

means it would be likely to have would be a generalized clocking mechanism. Applicant

13

 $N^{\prime}\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}(a) \wedge \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{M}}(a) \wedge$ 

Amdt. dated July 1, 2008

Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

suspects that there is no timing means that is specifically for controlling the duration of

pixel drive signals. Reconsideration is accordingly respectfully requested.

New claim 25 clarifies that the timing means varies the duration of at least one pixel drive signal within a field in order to achieve a desired rms and/or mean voltage of

.

the pixel drive signal within that field, whereby an amount of light output by the

corresponding pixel is varied responsive to variations in duration of the pixel drive signal.

Applicant respectfully submits that this is not taught or suggested by the reference.

New Independent claim

Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claim 26 distinguishes even

more clearly over the references than the existing independent claims by specifying more

detail about how voltages are controlled - in particular, variation of a parameter relating

to timing in order to achieve a desired rms and/or mean voltage and therefore a desired

contrast.

Dependent claims

The Examiner has rejected a number of dependent claims generally over Knapp,

but has not separated out in the rejections what the grounds are for each dependent claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of the dependent claims therefore fail to

satisfy 37 CFR 1.104.

14

NEUrodná frikat Applications dis profesiono disposición suco de compositores de la compositore della compositore de la compositore della compositore de la compositore della c

Amdt. dated July 1, 2008

Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

Applicant further respectfully submits that the rejected dependent claims recite

further patentable distinctions over the reference. Some examples follow.

Claim 3

This claim recites second row pulse on a row conductor timed with the application

of the second drive voltage on the column conductor. This is within a field, because the

claim depends from claim 1.

So far as Applicant can tell from Knapp, the second pulse on the row conductor is

not timed with a second drive voltage on the column conductor within a field. Applicant

does not believe, therefore, that the reference teaches or suggests claim 3. Reconsideration

is respectfully requested.

Claim 16

This claim recites a voltage waveform for the pixel drive signal that has two levels.

Applicant is not seeing this taught or suggested in Knapp, where it appears that the pixel

drive signal has only one level, as opposed to the row drive signal, which apparently has

more than one. Reconsideration is accordingly respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that he has addressed each issue raised by the

Examiner — except for any that were skipped as moot — and that the application is

accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

15

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL CONTRACTOR AND ASSESSION OF THE PROFESSION AND ASSESSION OF THE PROFESSION AND ASSESSION ASSES

Appl. No. 10/550,053 Amdt. dated July 1, 2008 Reply to Office action of Apr. 4, 2008

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270.

Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By <u>[Anne E. Barschall]</u>
Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089
Tcl. no. 914-332-1019
Fax no. 914-332-7719

.By <u>/Frank J. Keegan/</u> Frank J. Keegan, Reg. 50,145 Attorney (914) 333-9669 July 1, 2008